

Comment on the AR6 Second Draft of IPCC Working Group 1 (WG1) report. February 2020

"IPCC Review Criteria from e-mail to me dated Feb 17, 2020"

"The SOD Expert Review is a formal component of the IPCC assessment process to provide a balanced and comprehensive assessment of the latest scientific findings. The IPCC Procedures state that the review process will be objective, open and transparent, with an open invitation for experts to register, seeking a range of views, expertise, and geographical representation."

Dear sir/madam,

I reviewed the first draft, at the encouragement of Professor Richard Betts. I thus submitted quite a few recommended edits/additions and noted significant omissions in my expert reviewer response to the first draft.

In reviewing the latest draft, I am very disappointed that none of my comments were responded to in the report, nor even in any point-by-point response to my specific comments. It was wasted time for me to prepare my comments.

I was hoping that this time the IPCC process would be inclusive and assess the diversity of perspectives by climate scientists. This is clearly not the case.

The WG1 report, as currently drafted, will be seen by many in my community as a continuation of using the IPCC process as an advocacy for a particular view on the subject. With so much at stake, this, in my view, is an abrogation of what the IPCC was tasked to do in providing an objective peer reviewed-based assessment of the role of humans in the climate system and estimating resulting risks. The WG1 draft has failed with respect to this goal.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Roger A. Pielke Sr.", written in black ink.

Roger A Pielke Sr.